**Introduction**

* **Background**

Over the years agricultural research approaches have evolved through different phases and brought us the new brave world of innovation systems perspective. From the old linear research-extension-farmer approach….. Luck of consideration of the very complex and interrelated nature of agricultural problem by the previous approaches was one the main reason for their dismal impact on the livelihood of smallholder farmers. Recognition of this reality is one of the main driving forces for a change to a more dynamic, inclusive and system oriented research paradigm. The innovation system perspective is unique as its takes into account “totality of actors” and their involvement from the generation of technologies, their effective use (innovation) and other important institutional, market and policy dimensions. According to (Innovation guide) agricultural Innovation Systems perspective has a major point of departure from the earlier approaches which is the recognition that it gives to institutional challenges and multi-stakeholder engagement. The perspective advocates for users and suppliers of knowledge and other services to interact from the outset to ensure innovation takes place within the value chains. The aim is to combine existing knowledge types (local and global) to generate technological, institutional and organizational innovations.

Application of the innovation system perspective in agriculture has become very popular in different CGIAR lead agricultural Research-for-Development programs. Africa RISING project which is led by the International Livestock Research Institute has also embraced this perspective to guide the way how agricultural knowledge is generated, disseminated and utilized.

* **IP approaches in Research and development**

One of the mechanisms to integrate the innovation systems approach in agricultural research and development initiatives is through innovation platforms. Innovation platforms are considers as vehicles to bring together different shareholders for learning and action. Although IPs can be context specific and may serve different purpose its main objective is to serve as a fora for different stakeholders to jointly diagnose problems and implement solution which in the process ownership is insured. () defines IP as

ILRI has been using the innovation platform approach in its previous (Fodder adoption and NBDC) and ongoing (Africa RISING, Humidtropics) research projects. IPs at different levels have been used to jointly identify and priorities research problems and identify entry points within the realm of a wider research agenda designed by programs and projects. Africa RISING project in the Ethiopian highlands is has also established and operationalized IPs as its research sites to better facilitate and increase its research impact.

* **AR IP environment**
* How is established (Levels, where, when (after some diagnostic studies) ToR, Training given, ).

**Methods and approaches for Monitoring and evaluation of IPs** ( not much done on M&E of IPs ,tools, how data collected, who-ILRI and IP champions and coordinators. Table of indicators from the protocol.)

Pilot AR IP M&E results

* IP establishment process
* Activity report
* Stakeholder interaction
* IP Training evaluations
* IP member evaluations
* Msc stories

### **Monitoring and Evaluation of Innovation platforms**

A world café to capture feedbacks of participants was exercised on five of monitoring and evaluation data collection sheets. Table 7 summarizes different reflections given for each tool. The process ensured partners’ participation in the development of the IP M&E system with the inputs to be used to refine the IP M&E tools and indicators.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IP establishment sheet | Training Evaluation sheet | IP member Evaluation tool | Stakeholder Interaction sheet | IP registers and activity report |
| ***Tool 1*** | ***(ool 4*** | ***Tool 3*** | ***Tool 5*** | ***Tool 2a & 2b*** |
| * Should include gender disaggregated information * Composition of IP members should be clearly stated * Roles and responsibilities of actors should be documented * More detailed information on the establishment process should be captured | * Questions about ‘training expectation’ can be included * Information about ‘suitability of training environment’ can be one general aspect of training to be evaluated * Not only ‘timeline of training’ but time management on the training should be evaluated | * While evaluating ‘planed vs achieved’ it shouldn’t only focus on quality of activities but also if timelines/schedules are met * Include questions to see how major IP activities were gender sensitive | * Information related with stakeholders, common agenda can be captured in the tool * In measuring tightness of stakeholders’ linkages, the scores in the score ranking should be attached to meanings | * Put separate column for telephone and email * ‘Name of Member’ should be changed by ‘Name of Participant’ as non IP members could participate in IP initiated events * Place or site of activities should be captured |